DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 943 EC 222 093

TITLE	Gifted Education: A State Plan for New Jersey.
INSTITUTION	New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton. Div. of General Academic Education.
PUB DATE	Jul 87
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New Jersey State Department of Education, Distribution Services, 225 West State St., Trenton, NJ 08625 ($3.25 prepaid, make payable to: Treasurer, State of New Jersey).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academically Gifted; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Needs Assessment; Program Development; *State Departments of Education; State Programs; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This state plan identifies New Jersey Department of Education activities for assisting local school districts in designing educational programs to meet the needs of intellectually and academically gifted students. The plan begins with an identification of needs in the area of gifted education, focusing on the need for multiple measures for student identification, differentiated programs, staff training, and a sound evaluation design. Four department goals are then discussed, along with objectives and evaluation plans: (1) providing statewide leadership in gifted education, (2) providing assistance to districts through training and dissemination of materials, (3) assessing the current status of gifted education and providing information concerning relevant developments in the field, and (4) encouraging public support for and community awareness of gifted education. The document concludes with a timeline for plan implementation, a historical review of gifted education in New Jersey, and a bibliography. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED315943

GIFTED EDUCATION:

A State Plan for New Jersey

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L F Price

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 222093

TEACHING LEARNING TESTING

New Jersey Department of Education, Division of General Academic Education

Additional copies of this publication may be obtained by forwarding a prepaid written request to:

New Jersey State Department of Education
Distribution Services
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

There is a $3.25 charge per copy. Checks or money orders should be made payable to: "TREASURER, STATE OF NEW JERSEY." Please allow four to six weeks for delivery.

A price list and order form for other publications issued by the department are available upon request.

GIFTED EDUCATION:

A State Plan for New Jersey

Saul Cooperman
Commissioner of Education

Joel Bloom
Assistant Commissioner
Division of General Academic Education

Prepared by
Jeanne Carlson

New Jersey State Department of Education
225 West State Street
CN 500
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

July, 1987
P.T.M. #600.96

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JOHN T. KLAGHOLZ President	Seaside Park
JAMES JONES Vice President	Teaneck
S. DAVID BRANDT	Cherry Hill
MAUD DAHME	Annandale
BETTY A. DEAN	East Orange
MATEO F. DeCARDENAS	Union City
ANNE S. DILLMAN	Perth Amboy
ALICE A. HOLZAPFEL	Elizabeth
ROBERT H. MARIK	Princeton
NANCY SCHAENEN	Madison
JAMES M. SEABROOK, SR	Bridgeton
ROBERT A. WOODRUFF	Elmer
DEBORAH P. WOLFE Representing the State Board of Higher Education	Cranford

Saul Cooperman, Commissioner of Education
Secretary

T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education
Ex-Officio

FOREWORD

This State Plan in Gifted Education represents the department's response to the on-going need to improve gifted education in our state. In reaffirming the goal of excellence in education for all students, this plan emphasizes the importance of meeting the needs of gifted students and establishes a positive direction toward accomplishing this task.

As Commissioner of Education, I have taken a stance in support of providing appropriate programs for gifted students and have sought statutory authority to provide a funding base for local districts. I shall continue to work cooperatively with the Governor and the educational community to secure such legislation. Gifted education continues to be a priority issue as the department attempts to ensure that every child will receive a thorough and efficient education.

Gifted children are one of this nation's most precious resources. New Jersey's commitment to identifying and providing appropriate programs for gifted children is substantial and sound. Our concern for gifted children can be no less than to help these children realize their potential by guiding them to be all they can be.

This state plan is designed to provide local schools with assistance in serving intellectually and academically gifted children in their districts.

Saul Cooperman
Commissioner of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose	1
The Identification of the Needs	1
Summary of Identified Statewide Needs in Gifted Education	6
Goals, Objectives, Evaluation	6
Action Plan - Timelines	15
Appendices	
A. Historical Perspective	18
B. Commissioner's Advisory Council on Gifted Education	20
C. Needs Addressed	21
D. Regional Curriculum Services Units	22
E. Bibliography	23

GIFTED EDUCATION: A STATE PLAN FOR NEW JERSEY

PURPOSE

The purpose of this state plan is to identify the Department of Education activities that will be initiated to assist local school districts in designing educational programs to meet the needs of intellectually and academically gifted students.

THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE NEEDS

For the purposes of this plan, the Department of Education has identified needs in the area of gifted education by consulting various sources. These sources include research conducted by experts in gifted education, national and state reports, and the recommendations and observations of the Commissioner's Advisory Council for Gifted Education.

The findings from these sources substantiate the position that the use of multiple measures for identification, differentiated programs for gifted students, staff training, and a sound evaluation design are necessary in order to adequately meet the needs of this school population.

Research in Gifted Education

Student Identification

Treffinger (1984) challenges educators to look at different identification procedures in order to make progress in the field of gifted education. Sternberg (1984) states that the identification of giftedness has focused traditionally upon the I.Q. He believes, however, that educators must look beyond the I.Q. in order to adequately identify and serve gifted children. Gold (1986) states that one thing that "makes the whole world kin" is expressed disenchantment with intelligence testing; another is the contrary and continued reliance upon intelligence test scores. Richert (1982) affirms that, when identifying gifted students, information on academic potential, creativity, or productivity, as well as affective and special needs and interests, is essential. Multiple and complementary procedures are necessary to reveal the many facets of intellectual and academic giftedness.

Torrance (1977), Davis and Rimm (1985), Renzulli (1984), and Richert (1982) have emphasized the need to explore new ways of identification and programming in order to provide services that acknowledge the diversity of the group called gifted. Every ethnic and racial group (Gallagher, 1985; Marland, 1972) and all socioeconomic levels (Adler, 1967; Gay, 1978) have

gifted children. Aggressive, innovative identification procedures may be necessary to ensure that disadvantaged populations have proportionately the same number of children receiving services as the more advantaged.

Frasier (1986), Sternberg (1986), Hagen (1980), Baldwin (1978), and Torrance (1977) are concerned that culturally different gifted students often exhibit their abilities in ways which are not standard and, therefore may be excluded from programs for the gifted. The use of intelligence tests or other test sources as the sole indicator of giftedness also prevents many gifted students from being included in programs and receiving services as reported by Borland (1986), Juntune (1982), Hatch and Gardner (1986), Hagen (1980), Treffinger and Renzulli (1986). Kitano and Kirby (1986) believe that the identification process continues to be the reason for noninclusion of disadvantaged and minority students in programs for the gifted.

Multiple measures for identification of all populations of gifted students are recommended (Richert, 1982). According to Kaplan (1974), Van Tassel-Baska (1986), Tannenbaum (1983), and Gallagher (1984) these measures should include not only tests, but also nominations from parents, teachers, peers, and self, as well as critical observations, community achievements, and productive work. Brandwein (1986) states that "self-selection" by remarkable achievement becomes the test of creativity and believes that student products, as an indication of self-selection, must be considered when identifying the gifted child. Tannenbaum (1983) believes we have to expand our methods of identification to include critically acclaimed performance or exemplary production of ideas. He states that critical observation of student products is an important component in identifying giftedness.

Differentiated Programs

Torrance (1962) states that the abilities of some children exceed those of their age peers to such an extent that special educational programs and opportunities must be made available to them as individuals and within a group of intellectual peers to meet their needs. Stanley (1977) and Kaplan (1974) emphasize the need for gifted pupils to learn at a rate commensurate with their abilities while Sato (1985) argues that gifted students should not be barred from pursuing more advanced, complex, and sophisticated studies simply because they have not attained proficiency in all aspects of the basic or regular curriculum.

Differentiating the curriculum for gifted students is one of the most important educational considerations when establishing programs. Fliegler (1961) states that the "quintessence for educating the gifted is curriculum differentiation - a differentiation based upon the needs of the child." The Marland Report (1972) also asserts that gifted children require differentiated educational programs and services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program. Kaplan (1974) affirms that a scope and sequence curriculum is essential in providing an appropriate education for gifted students and adds that differentiating the curriculum must be a primary consideration for educators. Passow (1984) explains that differentiating the curriculum provides a match between the learner's unique potential for outstanding performance and learning opportunities. However,

Gold states that few reports on approaches to organizing an integrated curriculum for the gifted were presented at the 1986 world conference on gifted education in Hamburg.

Although an integrated K-12 "scope and sequence" curriculum has not received adequate attention, New Jersey school districts have attempted to differentiate their gifted education curriculum by incorporating a variety of models. Bloom's taxonomy (1956) has been widely considered by educators of the gifted as they attempt to incorporate higher-level thinking processes in a differentiated curriculum. Many other models are in use including: Parnes, Boller, and Biondi's (1977) creative problem solving; William's (1972) total creativity program; Taylor's (1968) multi-talent approach; Ward's (1980) DEG, or Differentiated Education for the Gifted; Renzulli's (1977) enrichment triad; Taba's (1964) cognitive functioning in elementary school children; Meeker's (1969) structure of the intellect; Gordon's (1971) synectics; Torrance's (1974) future problem solving; Kohlberg's (1971) moral development; Tannenbaum's (1983) enrichment matrix; Phenix's (1964) realms of meaning; Betts' (1985) autonomous learner; and Tennant's (1980) gifted extension model.

Staff Training

In addition to establishing identification procedures and developing differentiated curriculum, local districts should consider staff training in gifted education as a basic requirement for meeting the needs of gifted students. Staff training should increase the local staff's technical skills and knowledge about appropriate identification procedures, curriculum offerings, and programming for the gifted. It also should increase the staff's awareness of the attitudes and varied abilities of gifted children (Gallagher, 1985; Khatena, 1982; and Richert, 1982).

Each school district should be committed to the continuing education of all its professional staff. As the expertise of administrators, supervisors, teachers, and ancilliary staff increases in the area of gifted education, the expectation for professional performance also increases and the entire school benefits (Treffinger, 1981). An effective school district, therefore, will provide staff training for the continued professional growth of its staff.

The staff training in gifted education should establish a district philosophy regarding gifted education; develop a district needs assessment; generate identification procedures; provide for a differentiated curriculum; explore counseling methods for the gifted; produce the use of local, state, or national resources; endorse parent involvement; encourage business and industry cooperation; and identify evaluation procedures.

Program Evaluation

Evaluation of programs for the gifted should include both formative (continuing) and summative (final) procedures. Formative evaluation should take place during each step in the development of a program, i.e., needs assessment, goal development, identification, curriculum differentiation,

planning for facilities and supplies, staff training, evaluation procedures, and scheduling of timelines. Based upon continuing formative evaluation, necessary changes may be made to improve and/or expand the program during the school year (Kaplan, 1974).

Summative evaluation should take place after each phase of implementation to ensure that the established goals and objectives are being met. An important aspect of the summative evaluation should be assessment of pupil progress. Based upon this evaluation, necessary changes or adaptations to the program may be planned and implemented during the following school year (Vassar, 1979).

National Reports

The recent national reports, in particular, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), reveal that the gifted are among the pupils whose needs are poorly served in the United States. The National Report on Identification: Assessment and Recommendations for Comprehensive Identification of Gifted and Talented Youth (1982) reveals that many existing identification practices are biased. This report recommends more stringent rules to guarantee the comprehensive and equitable use of identification procedures. According to this publication, rules and regulations are important both to find the underachieving pupils who are presently not served and to avoid charges of elitism. The report refutes the belief that the gifted can "make it on their own". This report also cites research that shows that equality of educational opportunity does not mean provision of identical programs for all students. Where ability is concerned, equality consists of providing equally well for all kinds and levels of individual differences (Passow, 1979).

Additional national reports state that in the absence of appropriate educational programs, there are patterns of underachievement among gifted students (National Commission on Excellence, 1983; the Richardson Study, 1985) and "low functioning" of gifted students (Marland Report, 1972).

State Reports[1]

Data received by the New Jersey State Department of Education from 1980 to 1986 have revealed a dramatic increase each year in the number of gifted programs offered. Although the number of programs for the gifted has increased significantly (New Jersey Department of Education Survey in Gifted Education, 1985-86), wide disparities exist among districts as to the identification of and/or programming for intellectually/academically gifted stu-

[1]For further information concerning the history of gifted education in New Jersey, see Appendix A - Historical Perspective, pp. 18-19.

dents. This information points to the need to establish comprehensive identification procedures, program standards, differentiated curricula, supplemental educational enrichment opportunities, and evaluation procedures.

In 1981, the first major survey of gifted education was conducted by the department and resulted in the report "Study of Existing Pilot Programs for Gifted and Talented Pupils in New Jersey Public Schools." This survey was required by the Public Laws of 1979. Pilot programs in twenty-two urban, suburban, and rural districts were carefully evaluated through the survey; and the following needs were identified:

- Additional funds - Additional funds are needed by districts to cover the costs of specialized personnel and other resources needed for gifted programs.

- Use of multiple identification criteria - Districts must use multiple measures to identify their gifted students in order to obtain comprehensive data upon which to base their decisions about programming for these students. Districts may use individual or group achievement, aptitude, and creativity tests; biographical inventories and checklists from teachers, counselors, parents, and peers; student interviews and project evaluations; and interest inventories and self-nominations as measures for identifying their gifted students.

- Specialized programs - Specialized programs with differentiated curricula for identified gifted students are needed by districts to serve gifted students appropriately.

- Scheduled meeting times - In order to be effective, programs must meet on a regular basis and offer special group and/or individual activities specifically designed for gifted students.

- Use of resources from multiple districts - Cross-district sharing of human and material resources that facilitate program planning is needed to ensure that districts have a variety of resources available for gifted students.

The Commissioner's Advisory Council on Gifted Education[2]

The New Jersey Commissioner's Advisory Council for Gifted Education is a group composed of representatives from various professional organizations, parent and community groups, and the private sector. The council, which has met regularly since 1979, has recommended that the following areas be addressed by the state plan for gifted education:

[2]For further information concerning the composition of the Commissioner's Advisory Council on Gifted Education, see Appendix B, p. 20.

- professional development programs in gifted education for both state and school district personnel;
- development of a resource data bank for gifted education, including research materials, as well as program networking information;
- comprehensive, state-developed evaluation criteria that can be used as part of a uniform monitoring process; and
- communication between state and local personnel to enhance the programs and educational opportunities for the gifted, as well as to share experiences, research findings, and expertise.

SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED STATEWIDE NEEDS IN GIFTED EDUCATION

As a result of the previously described needs assessment which utilized current research, national and state reports, and the recommendations of the advisory council, the department has identified six needs as the most critical for gifted education in New Jersey. These needs are as follows:

1. To make the education of intellectually and academically gifted students an educational priority;
2. To foster the use of multiple, unbiased identification criteria when identifying the gifted;
3. To establish model statewide program standards for developing differentiated curricula and providing educational opportunities for the gifted;
4. To provide model comprehensive evaluation criteria for programs for the gifted;
5. To provide professional training and dissemination of model program materials; and
6. To foster the development and identification of resources (both human and material) for the gifted through networking/communication channels.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, EVALUATION

Through its activities related to gifted education, the department has established four major goals. These goals, along with objectives based upon the identified needs and plans for evaluation, are examined below.[3]

[3]For a summary listing the needs addressed, the goals and objectives established, and the department's response to the identified needs, see Appendix C - Needs Addressed, p. 21.

GOAL 1 The Department of Education will provide statewide leadership in gifted education:

Objective 1.1 - The Guidelines for Gifted Education

- To develop, disseminate, and periodically review guidelines to provide school districts with assistance in the implementation of gifted education

The Department of Education will develop a series of guidelines in gifted education. These guidelines will provide assistance to districts in the implementation of a local district plan in gifted education that includes the following:

- an initial assessment to determine district needs for a gifted program for its intellectually and academically gifted pupils;
- the use of multiple measures (such as achievement tests, behavioral checklists, nominations, etc.) to identify appropriately the intellectually and academically gifted;
- differentiated educational programs during school hours;
- appropriate, differentiated educational opportunities (using programs or activities designed to supplement and/or enhance learning within and/or beyond the classroom);
- staff development activities for teachers, coordinators, counselors, and administrators; and
- designs for program evaluation which include both process and outcome components.

A series of booklets, entitled Guidelines in Gifted Education, will elaborate on these areas and on comprehensive district planning, counseling, career awareness, mentorship opportunities, and the use of resources (both human and material) to assist in implementing the above.

Evaluation

The Department of Education is preparing guidelines in several areas of gifted education. Once in place, the guidelines will be evaluated as to their usefulness by surveying districts, obtaining feedback from training sessions, and assessing the degree to which the guidelines are incorporated into district plans and activities.

Objective 1.2 - Gifted Education Grants

The Department of Education will continue to provide annual funding through a competitive grant proposal process for the development, identification, and replication of gifted education programs. The department will:

- administer a competitive grant program to provide funding made available from state appropriations;
- develop an array of exemplary and demonstration programs for adoption/adaptation by other districts; and
- stimulate continued research and development of programs in gifted education.

Districts will be encouraged to research and develop various options for providing services/programs to their gifted students. Such work should result in differentiated programs that can serve as model programs for adoption/adaptation by other school districts.

Priority areas in gifted education will be identified annually in response to the identified needs. To qualify for funding, district proposals must provide:

- a rationale for the proposed program - e.g., a statement as to how well the proposal is supported by research and district need;
- a statement to support the effectiveness of the proposal - e.g., a statement demonstrating the use of the practice within the district;
- a work plan - e.g., a statement explaining the timelines, staff utilization, resources required, budget, proposed activities, and evaluation; and
- a statement to support the portability of the program - e.g., a statement explaining the extent to which the materials developed would facilitate program replication within other districts.

Through this process, the department will establish a resource of those programs which have been implemented and carefully evaluated within specific areas of giftedness. Each fall, three regional workshops which highlight the funded grants will be conducted so that school districts may adapt and/or adopt such programs to meet the needs of their own gifted population.

This objective has been a part of the department's practice. Since FY 1983-84, the DOE has awarded $580,000 to fund thirty grants.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the gifted education grants will be carried out in three phases. First, the local proposals will be reviewed to determine if they

comply with the conditions stipulated in the Request for Proposals (RFP) and focus upon the identified priority areas in gifted education. Second, the projects will be monitored for adherence to proposed activities and success in meeting intended outcomes. Third, the replicability of projects will be determined by such data as the number of districts requesting information about specific projects, the number of districts actually using project-developed materials, and completion of a survey evaluating the project-developed materials by districts using the materials.

GOAL 2 The Department of Education will provide assistance to districts through training and dissemination of materials.

Objective 2.1 - Assistance

- To provide training for state and school district personnel
- To develop training materials in gifted education, including identification procedures, the differentiation of curricula, and evaluation models
- To disseminate information and materials concerning gifted education

The Department of Education will plan for and assist in the training of school district personnel in gifted education. In order to assist in the implementation of district plans in gifted education, the Regional Curriculum Services Units (RCSUs) and county office personnel will be trained in the areas affected by the guidelines. Assistance in turn will be provided to districts in formulating their plan with regard to needs assessment, the use of identification criteria, the establishment of differentiated curricula, and staff development. In addition, professional training and the distribution of program materials will be available at state and regional workshops and conferences.

Evaluation

Assistance provided to school district personnel will be evaluated by feedback forms at the state forum and regional workshops, as well as through follow-up surveys to assess the overall improvements in district programs based on the degree to which these programs incorporate the issues covered in the training sessions.

Objective 2.2 - School District Plans in Gifted Education

- To review and evaluate (upon request) school district plans in gifted education

In order to provide districts with assistance in establishing a district plan that follows the state guidelines for gifted education, districts may submit their plans to the Department of Education for evaluation. District plans should be developed for a three-year period, the time typically necessary for districts to plan, develop, implement, and evaluate a program.

Evaluation

The evaluation of school district plans will depend upon department review of responses to a district-completed survey.

Objective 2.3 - Educational Opportunities

- To encourage the use of appropriate national and state programs for the gifted
- To encourage the development of consortia among school districts

A wide variety of educational opportunities are available to gifted students. Educational opportunities include those programs and experiences offered to gifted students in a school or community setting to supplement and/or enhance differentiated curricula. The department will publish an annotated list of established state and national programs, including our Governor's Schools, that offer educational opportunities for the gifted, as well as additional resource materials. This information may help districts maximize use of resources to provide other educational experiences for gifted students and to promote the establishment of consortia among districts.

Evaluation

The evaluation of this objective will be completed through the annual state survey in gifted education which will provide feedback about the type, number, and growth of national and state programs available for gifted students and the number of consortia established among districts.

GOAL 3 The Department of Education will continue to assess the current status of gifted education and provide information concerning relevant developments in the field in order to promote, support, and improve the education of the gifted.

Objective 3.1 - State Forum and Regional Workshops

- To continue to conduct the annual state forum on issues in gifted education

- To continue to provide regional workshops highlighting the department's funded grant programs in gifted education

The state forum offers educators the opportunity to hear nationally recognized experts speak on issues affecting gifted education. It is designed to offer current information and stimulate in-depth discussion with presenters on such topics as the identification of the gifted, differentiated curricula, creativity, intelligence, the formation of business/education liaisons, problem-solving techniques, and the rights of the gifted student.

Three regional workshops are presented annually to provide educators with information and hands-on activities developed by those districts whose programs were funded through the competitive grants process. These programs may serve as models for districts to adopt and/or adapt for use locally.

Evaluation

Evaluation forms completed by the participants at the annual forum and regional workshops will provide feedback to the department as to the effectiveness of the workshops. In addition, the evaluation forms will be analyzed to provide direction for future workshops.

The number of model programs adapted or adopted by districts will provide the department with information about the practical value of the regional workshops to the districts in the implementation of their gifted programs.

Objective 3.2 - Resource Information

- To establish a clearinghouse of resources for educators and parents of the gifted

In order to better assist districts with the planning and implementation of their plans for gifted education, a wide variety of resource materials will be available in the RCSU resource centers.[4] These resources will be selected by grade level, degree of difficulty, differentiation, content, etc. In addition, a list of gifted education consultants will be published for districts to contact at their discretion.

Evaluation

The completion of the resource information within stated timelines will be monitored. Next, users will be surveyed through an evaluation form distributed by the RCSUs to ensure that the contents and mode of operation of the data bank are appropriate to district needs.

[4]For further information concerning the Regional Curriculum Service Units (RCSU), See Appendix D, p. 22.

Objective 3.3 - Publications

- To develop an annual report on the status of gifted education
- To develop and disseminate to local school districts a semi-annual Department of Education newsletter

The Department of Education will generate an annual report concerning the status and needs of gifted education in New Jersey to be submitted to the New Jersey State Board of Education and to be made available to the legislature and local school districts.

The Department of Education will publish a semi-annual newsletter addressing current issues in gifted education. Included in the newsletter will be program information and instructional materials, general information on gifted education, research, upcoming dates of conferences and workshops, and other information pertaining to gifted education.

Evaluation

The timely publication of these products with content consistent with their stated objectives will be evaluated. Recipients will be surveyed for feedback on these publications.

Objective 3.4 - Annual Survey in Gifted Education

- To obtain current information concerning the status of gifted education throughout the state

The Survey in Gifted Education currently is conducted annually to ascertain the number of gifted students served, the types of programs offered, the number of personnel employed, and the amount of money expended. This annual survey is conducted in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA).

The survey will continue to assist the Department of Education in updating and revising information regarding the services delivered to gifted students throughout the state, district by district. In addition, the survey will be one of the mechanisms through which districts may report to the department the number of gifted students identified and served, the plans that have been developed, the kinds of differentiated programs being provided, and feedback about the department's assistance.

Evaluation

The annual survey will be analyzed yearly to determine if changes in the department's assistance efforts are warranted.

GOAL 4 The Department of Education will encourage public support for and community awareness of gifted education.

Objective 4.1 - Networking

- To continue the work of the Commissioner's Advisory Council in Gifted Education as a mechanism for coordinating input on the direction of gifted education
- To encourage and support networking among school districts and between the Department of Education and the districts

The Commissioner's Advisory Council offers guidance to the Commissioner of Education on issues affecting gifted education, e.g., the need for secondary programs for the gifted, the importance of early identification of the gifted, the need to identify underachieving gifted, and the importance of training for administrators. This council, which consists of representatives from education, parents, the community, and business and industry, will continue to meet to advise the Commissioner about gifted education.

Networking between and among the school districts and the department will be encouraged. The establishment of consortia and cooperative efforts between the business and educational communities, including the Governor's Schools and higher education, will be supported. The purpose of such networking is to maintain lines of communication concerning the potential for sharing of resources and information for use by school districts.

Evaluation

The measure to evaluate networking will be our tracking of the number and kinds of networks established and the activities undertaken.

Objective 4.2 - Support the establishment of business/education liaisons

- To encourage and support the establishment of business and education liaisons

The Department of Education and the Commissioner's Advisory Council will attempt to identify various private business corporations to establish business/education liaisons. These liaisons will be established to support a wide variety of educational opportunities, including: mentorships; career shadowing; convocations and symposiums; use of learning centers; access to laboratories, libraries, or institutions of higher education; and field trips.

Evaluation

Since this category was included to encourage the formation of business/education liaisons, it will be evaluated by the number and types of links developed. The degree of commitment from the various external groups participating will be measured by tracking the resources allocated and the length of time the commitment is maintained.

ACTION PLAN

Timelines for the Implementation of New Jersey State Plan Gifted Education

Goal I - Statewide Leadership

Objectives	Responsibility	Completion Date
1. Develop guidelines for gifted education	Gifted Consultant, GAE	September, 1987
2. Provide gifted education competitive grant funds	Operations Manager, GAE	Annually. Submitted March Awarded June
a. Award grants	Operations Manager, GAE	Annually, May
b. Monitor grants	Gifted Consultant, GAE	Annually, January

Goal II - Training

Objectives	Responsibility	Completion Date
1. Provide Assistance		
a. RCSU & county offices	Gifted Consultant, GAE	May, 1987
b. School districts	Gifted Consultant, GAE RCSUs, County Offices Advisory Council	August 1988
2. Review district plans in gifted education	Assistant Commissioner, GAE	July, 1988- July, 1990
3. List educational opportunities	Gifted Consultant, GAE	September, 1987

Goal III - Provide Resources in Gifted Education

Objectives	Responsibility	Completion Date
1. Provide annual forum and regional workshops		
a. State forum	Gifted Program Specialist, GAE	Annually, May
b. Regional workshops (funded programs)	Gifted Consultant/ RCSU staff	Annually, October
2. Provide resource data bank	Gifted Consultant/	September, 1988
a. Located at RCSUs	RCSU Staff/ County Offices/ Advisory Council	
b. Updated annually		
3. Prepare publications		
a. Annual report	Gifted Consultant, GAE	Annually. August, 1988
b. Newsletter	Gifted Consultant, GAE	Semi-annually, 1989
4. Conduct survey in gifted education	Gifted Consultant, GAE	Annually, Distributed November
a. Distribute survey to districts		Returned, January
b. Survey analysis printed		Analyzed/Reported, September

Goal IV - Community Awareness

Objectives	Responsibility	Completion Date
1. Networking	Gifted Program Specialist RCSU Staff/County Offices/Advisory Council	September, 1989
2. Locate resources (business/ education liaisons)	Gifted Consultant/ Advisory Council	September, 1989
a. Commissioner's Advisory Council	Gifted Consultant/ Advisory Council	Four annually. Regularly scheduled meetings.
b. Regional Curriculum Services Units	Gifted Consultant/ Regional Curriculum Services Unit	Regularly Scheduled Meetings

Appendix A

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Efforts to promote the education of the gifted in New Jersey can be traced to as early as the year 1866 when multi-track classes were introduced into New Jersey public schools. Since that time various districts have experimented with ways to educate their gifted students, but focused statewide attempts to promote gifted education did not begin until the 1970's. At that time reports concerning educational opportunities for the gifted were developed by the Department of Education for the State Board of Education.

In August, 1973, the iepartment in concert with educators and parents submitted "A Report on the Education of the Gifted and Talented" to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education. As a result, two statewide conferences were held in 1974 and 1975. Further activities were conducted in the state under the auspices of the department in 1975 with convocations, in particular, being implemented both on a statewide and local basis.

A state commitment to gifted education began in 1975 when the Public School Act of 1975 was enacted. This law specified that an element of a thorough and efficient system of education shall include: "A breadth of program offerings designed to develop the individual talents and abilities of pupils" (N.J.S.A. 18A:7A-5(d)).

In fiscal year 1977, the department received a special state appropriation for gifted and talented education. These funds were used to partially fund a professional position in the Department of Education and a coordinator of gifted and talented education at each of the four Educational Improvement Centers. The center coordinators of gifted and talented education offered technical assistance to districts developing programs for the academically and creatively gifted and conducted workshops. At that time, the Department of Education supported gifted education through workshops, conferences, and special projects, including Olympics of the Mind, Talent Search, Convocations, etc.

In 1978 and 1979, with the support of the Commissioner's Advisory Council on Gifted and Talented Education, the department issued guidelines to school districts. The 1978 guidelines covered general procedures for all aspects of gifted and talented programs. The 1979 guidelines contained suggested procedures and instruments for identification of gifted students.

On September 13, 1979, the Governor signed into law the "Gifted Child Development Act" (Chapter 192, Public Laws of New Jersey). This legislation recognized that the public schools must identify and provide an appropriate education for all gifted and talented pupils. It required the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study of existing programs and to assess the current status and needs of gifted education in New Jersey. At the time of the enactment of Chapter 192, approximately one half (300) of the New Jersey school districts had programs which served over 25,000 identified gifted and

talented pupils. The results of the study were reported to the Governor and legislature in April, 1981. The study concluded that the Department of Education should design identification and program implementation procedures for the education of gifted and talented pupils. The New Jersey state plan for the gifted addresses the activities for implementation of this directive.

Today, programs for the gifted are dramatically increasing in New Jersey. In 1986, an estimated 111,000 pupils were receiving educational options in gifted education, an increase of approximately 300 percent since 1979 when the Gifted Child Development Act was passed. But disparities of program quality exist among gifted programs in different districts.

Appendix B

ORGANIZATIONAL COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSIONER'S ADVISORY COUNCIL IN GIFTED EDUCATION

Following is a list of organizations and affiliations which comprise the Commissioner's Advisory Council in Gifted Education:

Organization (Number of Representatives)

New Jersey Education Association (1)
New Jersey Educators of Gifted/Talented (2)
New Jersey Parent/Teacher Association (1)
Higher Education (1 Private, 1 Public)
New Jersey Principals & Supervisors Association (1)
New Jersey School Administrators Association (1)
New Jersey School Boards Association (1)
Business/Industry - New Jersey Partnership and New Jersey Business/Science Industry Consortium (2)
NJTESOL/BE Educators (1)
NJBEA - New Jersey Black Educators Association (1)
Consortia (1 parent, 1 school)
Commissioner's Discretionary Appointments (1)

Ex officio Members:

Regional Curriculum Service Units (RCSU) (1)
Clearinghouse in Gifted Education (1)
County Offices (1)
New Jersey Department of Education, Gifted Education Specialist (1)

Appendix C

NEEDS ADDRESSED

Following is an outline of the needs identified by the department of education. This form illustrates the established goals in which each need is addressed and the planned strategies through which the department will respond to the identified needs.

Identified Needs	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Strategies
A Gifted as an educational priority	X	X	X	X	Guidelines Grant Program Resource Data Bank Assistance
B Identification criteria	X	X			Guidelines Assistance
C Program standards, establishing, differentiated curricula	X	X	X	X	Guidelines Grant Program State Forum Regional Workshops Newsletter Assistance
D Evaluation criteria	X	X	X		Guidelines Grant Program Survey Monitoring Assistance
E Professional training	X	X	X	X	Guidelines State Forum Regional Workshops Assistance
F Development of resources and communication/networking	X	X	X		Guidelines Survey Resource Data Bank Forum Regional Workshops Newsletter

Appendix D

REGIONAL CURRICULUM SERVICE UNITS

Following is a list of the Regional Curriculum Service Unit directors with the address and phone number of each RCSU:

Director	Location	Phone Number
Robert Osak	RCSU North 240 South Harrison East Orange, N.J. 07017	(201) 266-8660
Elliot Solomon	RCSU Central 200 Old Matawan Road Old Bridge, N.J. 07747	(201) 390-6030
Charles Ivory	RCSU South 635 North Black Horse Pike Williamstown, N.J. 08094	(609) 629-3133

Appendix E

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, M. (1967). Reported incidence of giftedness among ethnic groups. Exceptional Children, 34, 101-105.

Arkansas Department of Education. (1984). Report: Arkansas advisory council for the education of gifted and talented children. Little Rock, AR.

Baldwin, A. Gear, G. and Lucito, L. (eds.) (1978). Educational planning for the gifted: Overcoming cultural, geographic and socio economic barriers. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Betts, G. (1985). The Autonomous Learner Model for the Gifted and Talented. Greeley, CO: Autonomous Learning Publications and Specialities.

Bishop, W.E. (1975). Characteristics of teachers judged successful by intellectually gifted, high achieving high school students. In Barbe, W.B. & Renzulli, J.S. (eds.) Psychology and educatin of the gifted, (2nd ed.) New York: Irvington Publishers.

Bloom, B.S. (ed.) (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Co.

Borland, J. H. (1986). I.Q. Tests: Throwing out the bath water, saving the baby. Roeper Review, 8(3), 163-167.

Brandwein, P. (1986, May). A portrait of gifted with science talent. Roeper Review, 8(4), 235-243.

Connecticut Department of Education. (1979). Con-Cept I, II, III, IV, reports. Hartford, CT.

Cox, J., Daniel N., & Boston, B. (1985). Educating able learners: Programs and practices (the Richardson Study the Pyramid Model). Forth Worth, TX: University of Texas Press.

Davis, G. A. & Rimm, S.B. (1984). Education of the gifted and talented program study. Tallahasee, FL: Florida Department of Education.

Davis, G.A. & Rimm, S.B. (1985). Education for the gifted and talented. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Feuerstein, R. In collaboration with Rand, Y. Hoffman, M.B., Miller R. Instrumental enrichment. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Frasier M. (1986). The identification of gifted black students developing new perspectives: (Unpublished Paper) Athens, GA: University of Georgia.

Gallagher, J.J. (1985). Teaching the gifted child, (3rd ed.), Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Gallagher, J.J. (1984). Excellence and equity - A worldwide conflict. Gifted International, 2(2), 1-11.

Gallagher, J.J. (1985). The evaluation of education for the gifted in differing cultures. In J. Freeman (ed.) The psychology of gifted children, (p. 335). Chichester, West Sussex England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Gallagher, J. Weiss, P. Oglesby, K and Thomas, T. (1983). The status of gifted/talented education: United States survey of needs, practices and policies. Los Angeles, CA: National State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and Talented.

Gay, J.E. (1978). A proposed plan for identifying black gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 22(3), 353.

Gold, M. (1983). Education of the gifted/talented. Ventura, CA: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools.

Gold, M.J. (May, 1986). Gifted: Not the same the world over: Roeper Review, 8(4), 252-256.

Gordon, E. W. and Wilkerson, D.A. (1966). Compensatory education for the disadvantaged. Programs and practices: Pre-school through college. New York: College Entrance Board.

Gordon, W.J. (1971). Synectics. New York: Collier Books.

Gowan, J.C., Khatena, J. & Torrance, E.P. (1981). Creativity: Its educational implications. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Hagen, E. (1980). Identification of the gifted. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Hatch, T.C. Gardner, H. (February, 1986) From testing intelligence to assessing competencies: A pluralistic view of intellict. Roeper Review, 8(3), 147-150.

Hopkins, R. and Gallagher, J.J. (eds.) (1981). Models for analysis of social policy. An introduction. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Juntune, J. (1982). Myth: The gifted constitutes a single, homogeneous group! Gifted Child Quarterly, 26(1), 9-10.

Kansas Department of Education. (1985). Education guidelines for education of the gifted programs. Topeka, KS.

Kaplan, S. (1974). Providing programs for the gifted and talented: A handbook. Ventura, CA: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools.

Khatena, J. (1982). Educational pyschology of the gifted. New York: John Wiley.

Kitano, M.K., and Kirby, D.F. (1986). Gifted education: A comprehensive view. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Kohlberg. L. (1971). Stages of moral development as the basis for world education. In Beck, C.M., Critenden, B.S. and Sullivan, E. V. (eds.) Moral education: interdisciplinary approaches. New York: Newman Press.

Marland, S.P., Jr. (1972). Education of the gifted and talented. (Vols. 1 and 2). Report to the Congress of the U.S. by the Commissioner of Education. Washington, D.C.

Meeker, M. (1969). The structure of the intellect: It's interpretation and uses. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Michigan Department of Education. (1986). District self assessment evaluation of programming for the gifted and talented (Pilot Project). Lansing, MI.

Mitchell, P. (ed.) (1981). An advocate's guide to building support for gifted and talented education. Washington, DC: National Association of the State Board of Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

New Jersey Department of Education: Division of Curriculum and Instruction. (1973). A report on the education of the gifted and talented. Trenton, NJ.

New Jersey Department of Education. (1981). Study of existing pilot programs for gifted and talented pupils in public schools. Trenton, NJ.

New Jersey Department of Education. (1985). Survey in Gifted Education. Trenton, NJ.

Parnes, S.J., Noller, R.B. and Biondi, A. (1977). Guide to creative actions (rev. ed.), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Passow, A.H. Reflections on three decades of education of the gifted. Roeper Review, 8(4), 223-226.

Passow, A.H. (ed). (1979). The gifted and the talented: Their education and development. (The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Passow, A.H. (1985). Administrative practice and the gifted and talented. Paper presented at the New Jersey Department of Education, second annual forum on issues in gifted education. Piscataway, N.J.

Pennsylvania State Education Association. (1983). Gifted and talented. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Phenix, P. (1984). Realms of meaning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Renzulli, J. S. (1984). The triad/revolving door system: A research approach to identification and programming for the gifted and talented. Gifted Child Quarterly, 28(4), 163-171.

Renzulli, J. (1977). The Enrichment triad model. Weathersfield, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Richert, E.S., Alvino, J., & McDonnel, R. (1981). National report on identification. Sewell, NJ: Educational Improvement Center, South.

Sato, I. (1974). Developing a written plan for the education of gifted and talented students. Ventura, CA: Office of Ventura County Superintendent of Schools.

Sato, I. (November, 1985). Curriculum implications. Paper presented at the National Association for Gifted Children Conference in Denver, Colorado.

Stanley, J., George, W.C. & Solano, C.H. (eds.). (1977). The gifted and the creative: Fifty-year perspective. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sternberg, R. (1984). What should intelligence tests? Implications of a triarchic theory of intelligence for intelligence testing. Educational Researcher, 13(1), 5-15.

Sternberg R. (1986) Paper presented at the NJ Department of Education third annual forum in gifted education, Busch College Student Center, Rutgers University.

Taba, H. (1964) Teaching strategies and cognitive functioning in elementary school children. USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 1574. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco State College.

Tannenbaum, A. (1983). Gifted children: Psychological and educational perspectives. New York: MacMillan.

Taylor, C. (1968). The Multiple Talent Approach. In Instructor, 77:142, 144-146.

Taylor, Roger. (1985). Paper presented at the National Association for Gifted Children Conference in Denver, Colorado.

Tennant, C.G. and Morgan, H.J. (1980). Elementary and secondary level programs for the gifted and talented. New York: Teachers College Press.

Torrance, E.P. (1977). Creatively gifted and disadvantaged gifted students. In Stanley, J.C., George, W.C. and Solano, C.H. (eds.) The gifted and the creative: A fifty year perspective. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Torrance, E.P., and Torrance, J. (1980). Participating students evaluate the 1979-80 Gerogia future problem solving program. Athens, GA: Georgia Studies of Creative Behavior.

Torrance, E. P. (1962). Guiding creative talent. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Torrance, E.P. (1981). Predicting the creativity of elementary school children (1958-80) and the teacher who made the difference. Gifted Child Quarterly, 25, 55-62.

Treffinger, D.J. (1984). Editorial: In search of identification. Gifted Child Quarterly, 26(1), 3-8.

Treffinger, D.J. and Renzulli, J.S. (February, 1986.) Giftedness as potential for creative productivity: Transcending IQ scores. Roeper Review, 8(3), 195-189.

Treffinger, D.J. (1981). Blending gifted education with the total school program. Buffalo, NY: Center for Creative Learning.

Van Tassel-Baska, J. (February, 1986) The use of aptitude tests for identifying gifted: The talent search concept. Roeper Review, 8(3), 185-189.

Vassar, W.G. (ed.) (1979). Conn-Cept 1: Practical suggestions for gifted and talented program development. Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Education.

Ward, V.S. (1980). Differential education for the gifted. Ventura, CA: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools.

West Virginia Department of Education. (1985). Report of the West Virginia task force on the education of intellectually gifted students. Charleston, WV.

Whitmore, J. (1980). Giftedness, conflict and underachievement. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Williams, F.E. (1972). A total creativity program kit. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zettel, J.J. (1980). Gifted and talented education from a nationwide perspective. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Referenced Citations:

N.J.S.A. 18A:7A-1 et seq. - Public School Act of 1975.

N.J.A.C. 6:4-1.1 et seq. - Equality in Educational Programs, 1975.

N.J.S.A. 18A:7A-5(d)

Gifted Child Development Act of 1979, P.L. 1979, Chapter 192.

JC/mh:1/1918j